19[illegible]

File No. [illegible]
Registration of Births
Legal Depth 50

K

BRANCH

Subject:— [illegible] the Registration of Births Act 1967.

P.1
E

File No. C. Prescribed Registration of Births

Gen. 194 c.

5(9—1).

Office of the R.L.A.

Section 4 of the Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, requires a declaration in respect of a press for the printing of books or papers. The word 'printing' has been construed strictly in a narrow sense to mean typography and as not to include process such as cyclostyling, and accordingly it has been held that the Roneo duplicator isnot a printing press. See Rameshwar Prasad v. Emperor A.I.R. 1931 Nagpur 177. Section 4 would not thus be applicable to a duplicator, and a prosecution under section 13 would not, therefore be feasible. Assuming that the definition or 'press' in section 2(7) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act iswide enough to include a duplicator, the seizure thereof without a proper warrant under section 17(1) would be irregular and unauthorised, and the forfeiture under section 17(3) of the machine without a warrant under section 17(1) cannot be sustained: Krishinghachandra Ghosh v. Emperor, 60 Calcutta 1103. Sections 47-49 of the City of Bombay Police Act would not be applicable to the cash. As there are conflicting claimants, the Commissioner of Police may await institution of legal proceedings for the return of property.

Id/- P.M.LAD.

Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

U.R.to H.D.No.479-Confl. dated 23rd June 1950.

RHB.
6.7.